

United States
Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

Miles City Field Office

Clapp Allotment
Grazing Transfer

Determination of NEPA Adequacy
DOI-BLM-MT-C020-2013-0156-DNA

For Further Information Please Contact:

Bureau of Land Management
Miles City Field Office
111 Garryowen Road
Miles City, Montana 59301
406-233-2800

BLM



DATE POSTED: May 21, 2013

DATE DUE: June 6, 2013

Worksheet
Documentation of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

BLM Office: Miles City

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-MT-C020-2013-0156-DNA

Case File/Project No: 2502888

Proposed Action Title/Type: Clapp Allotment Transfer

Location/Legal Description: Dawson Counties, Montana –
T. 17 N., R. 55 E., Secs. 20, 21, 27, 28, 33 and 34 (See allotment map)

A: Description of the Proposed Action:

The proposed action is to ensure the allotment continues to meet the Land Health Standards and issue a permit for the Clapp Allotment (#01378) to the current applicant. The term permit would be issued for ten years (May 1, 2013 through February 28, 2023). No changes would be made to the existing grazing schedule, grazing preference, kind of livestock, percent public land, type of use or the terms and conditions. The permit would be issued as follows:

GR# 2502888

Clapp Allotment #01378	Livestock Number	Livestock Kind	Grazing Begin	Period End	% PL	Type Use	AUMs
Clapp	32	Cattle	5/01	10/30	100	Custodial	193

Total Active AUMs: 193

Terms and Conditions:

Grazing not to exceed the carrying capacity of the public land.

Supplemental feed (includes salting) will not be placed within one quarter of a mile of stock watering facilities, riparian zones, hardwood draws or wetlands. Supplemental feed defined as feed that provides for improved livestock nutrition or rangeland management, but does not replace forage available from public lands.

Applicant: Permittee

County: Dawson County

DNA Originator: Bea Knudson

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name* * Big Dry RMP, ROD Date Approved: 1996

Other document: _____

Other document: _____

**List applicable LUPs (for example, resource management plans; activity, project, management, or program plans; or applicable amendments thereto)*

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

☒ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions). *This proposed action is in conformance with the Big Dry RMP ROD approved in 1996, as amended by the Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing for Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota ROD approved in 1997. The Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing for Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota ROD states on page 12 "Terms and conditions are a tool to achieve resource conditions in the standard". The Big Dry RMP ROD (page 11) recognizes livestock grazing within the preferred alternative of the final EIS.*

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document(s) and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

- Clapp Allotment Transfer EA - [MT-020-2006-201-EA](#)

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation and monitoring report).

- Standards for Rangeland Health Assessment July 1999
- Cultural Resources Report MT-020-06-250

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial? Yes. The proposed action is similar to those analyzed in the above referenced documents. The EA analyzed issuing the permit for the Clapp Allotment while analyzing grazing schedule, grazing preference, kind of livestock, percent public land, type of use, or the terms and conditions.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values? Yes. The alternatives in the existing Environmental Assessment analyzed the effects of livestock grazing. These alternatives were determined to be appropriate for the current proposed action.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstance would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action? Yes. No new information is available.

4. Are the direct, indirect and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document? Yes. The direct and indirect impact of the current proposed action is unchanged from the existing Environmental Assessment. The current proposed action is a renewal and the terms and conditions remain unchanged. The original EA analyzed the site-specific impacts livestock grazing would have on the allotment.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action? Yes. The public involvement and interagency review associated with the existing EA is adequate for the current proposed action per agency requirements.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource Represented</u>	<u>Initials & Date</u>
Dale Tribby	Lead Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife	dct 05/22/13
Reyer Rens	Supervisory RMS	Review	RR 5/23/2013


Environmental Coordinator

05/24/2013
Date

F. Mitigation Measures: List any applicable mitigation measures that were identified, analyzed, and approved in relevant LUPs and existing NEPA document(s). List the specific mitigation measures or identify an attachment that includes those specific mitigation measures. Document that these applicable mitigation measures must be incorporated and implemented.

CONCLUSION

- ☒ Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation In EA MT-020-2008-317 fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Note: If one or more of the criteria are not met, a conclusion of conformance and/or NEPA adequacy cannot be made and this box cannot be checked



Todd D. Yeager
Field Manager
Miles City Field Office

05/24/2013

Date

